

**REMARKS**

This Supplemental Amendment and Request for Continued Examination (RCE) are being filed because the statutory period for response to the May 25, 2004 Office Action has ended. No Advisory Action has been received at the offices of the undersigned indicating whether the Request for Reconsideration was persuasive. However, according to the private Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, an Advisory Action was mailed on October 5, 2004 and returned to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 7, 2004 (see Exhibits A-B attached hereto). Apparently no attempt to re-mail the Advisory Action or otherwise contact the undersigned was made.

**Request for Refund**

The fee for a three-month extension of time has been paid. However, due to the circumstances above, the Applicant requests a refund of the fee for the third-month extension of time, since it would have been possible to file the RCE and Supplemental Amendment by the end of the two-month extended period for response if the Advisory Action had been mailed properly.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In the May 25, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-18 were pending and rejected all of the claims as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,233,571 to Egger et al. as in the January 17, 2004 Office Action. Claim 19 has been added and thus, claims 1-19 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

According to the copy of the Advisory Action in PAIR, "[t]he CSPDM analyzes the information extracted by determining the characteristics of each object including its importance, degree of relatedness, ... etc. and then identifies a category of reason indicating why the referred document is cited." No citation to Egger et al. was provided. Presumably, "CSPDM" is a reference to the "Computer Search Program for Data represented in Matrices" disclosed by Egger et al.

In the May 25, 2004 Office Action, the explanation provided of how Egger et al. discloses the reference position extracting device is that the "CSPDM evaluates the indexed paragraphs of sections of a full text" (Office Action, page 3, lines 9-10). There is no suggestion in this statement that Egger et al. extracts "information about a position where the referred document is cited in the document data, and a feature in the neighborhood of the position" (e.g., claim 1, lines 4-6). Nothing has been found at the cited portions or elsewhere in Egger et al. of

performing these operations. Furthermore, nothing was cited or found in Egger et al. regarding "identifying a reason indicating why the referred document is cited in the referring document from the information about the position and the feature in the neighborhood of the position extracted" (e.g., claim 1, lines 8-10). Therefore, it is submitted that Egger et al. does not teach or suggest claim 1 or claims 2 and 3 that depend therefrom. Similarly, it is submitted that claims 4, 5, 10 and 12-19 that recite at least basing the reason for why a document or information was cited on a feature of the citing document located nearby, as well as claims 6-9 and 11 that depend therefrom, patentably distinguish over Egger et al.

In addition, claim 4 recites

extracting keyword information of the referred document from information in the neighborhood of the position where the reference document is cited; and ... outputting output information including the information extracted by the referred document extracting device, the category of the reason why the referred document is cited and the keyword information

(claim 4, last 5 lines) and claim 19 recites "extracting keyword information of the referred document from information in the neighborhood of a position where the referred document is cited in the given document data; and ... storing the keyword information as a keyword of the referred document in the keyword storage" (claim 19, last 5 lines). It is submitted that Eggers et al. does not teach or suggest objectively extracting keywords in the manner recited in claims 4 and 19. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 4 and 19 further patentably distinguish over Eggers et al.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Supplemental Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/26/04

By: Richard A. Gollhofer  
Richard A. Gollhofer  
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501



Application No.: 09/594,029

Mail Room Date	Document Description	Document Category	Page Count
10/07/2004	Mail returned to USPTO as undelivered	PROSECUTION	3
10/05/2004	Advisory Action (PTOL-303)	PROSECUTION	3
08/25/2004	Amendment After Final	PROSECUTION	4
05/25/2004	Final Rejection	PROSECUTION	11
03/19/2004	Applicant Arguments or Remarks Made in an Amendment	PROSECUTION	3
03/19/2004	Claim	PROSECUTION	6
03/19/2004	Fee Worksheet (PTO-875)	PROSECUTION	1
03/19/2004	Amendment	PROSECUTION	2
11/17/2003	Non-Final Rejection	PROSECUTION	10
11/03/2003	Examiner Search Notes	PROSECUTION	2
06/15/2000	Oath or Declaration filed	PROSECUTION	3
06/15/2000	Bibliographic Data Sheet	PROSECUTION	1
06/15/2000	Fee Worksheet (PTO-875)	PROSECUTION	1
06/15/2000	Fee Worksheet (PTO-875)	PROSECUTION	1
06/15/2000	Foreign Priority Papers Filed	PROSECUTION	71
06/15/2000	Information Disclosure Statement	PROSECUTION	2
06/15/2000	Issue Information on File Wrapper	PROSECUTION	1
06/15/2000	Search info on File Wrapper	PROSECUTION	1
06/15/2000	Claims recorded on File Wrapper	PROSECUTION	1
06/15/2000	Transmittal of New Application	PROSECUTION	2
06/15/2000	Drawings	PROSECUTION	28
06/15/2000	Specification	PROSECUTION	56
06/15/2000	Claim	PROSECUTION	10
06/15/2000	Abstract	PROSECUTION	1
05/25/2004	List of References cited by Applicant	PRIOR ART	2
11/17/2003	List of references cited by Examiner	PRIOR ART	1
06/15/2000	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART	6
06/15/2000	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART	5
06/15/2000	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART	6
06/15/2000	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART	9
06/15/2000	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART	11
06/15/2000	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART	10
06/15/2000	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART	6
06/15/2000	Foreign Reference	PRIOR ART	7
06/15/2000	Miscellaneous Incoming Letter	AS FILED	99
06/15/2000	Miscellaneous Incoming Letter	AS FILED	99

EXHIBIT A



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,029	06/15/2000	Koji Tsukamoto	826.1610/JDH	9256
21171	7590	10/05/2004	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			NGUYEN BA, PAUL H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED

OCT 07 2004

Technology Center 2100